

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 18

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

November 1, 1980

## OMB Timekeeping Rules Stir Campus Furor

Academe vs. the Office of Management and Budget is about to enter a new round as university administrators seek relief from the supposedly liberalized financial accounting requirements in the latest revision of OMB's infamously opaque Circular A-21, otherwise known as "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions."

Though the revision was supposed to reflect the Carter Administration's highly touted holy war against red tape and paperwork, the reading from academe is that the new version is just as onerous and obtuse as its predecessor. What particular gripes the clients in grantland is OMB's insistence on accounting for time spent on government-supported work—a requirement that many researchers ridicule as uncomprehending of the splintered nature of academic teaching and research schedules. So, there's a good deal of talk about pressing OMB to rethink A-21.

One idea currently receiving close inspection would

### *Scientists, Engineers for Carter Makes Low-Key Debut—Page 6*

involve a fundamental change in the basic philosophy that has guided the administration of research project grants for the past 35 years. These grants, which represent almost half of the federal basic research budget, are awarded to individual scientists in care of their institutions. The suggestion is that, once a grant has been approved for funding through the peer-review process, rather than the federal government agreeing to reimburse all costs that can be adequately documented at the termination of the project, the amount of the reimbursement would be agreed in advance, and the scientist's institution need merely show that "reasonable technical progress" had been made.

The result of this change would be to shift the emphasis of the government's auditing role from financial to scientific accountability, leaving the former primarily to the institution which administers the scientist's grant. Among the attractions is that such a mechanism would remove from the individual scientist the requirement to provide full documentation—as required under Circular A-21—of the division of effort among research, teaching and administration. The main concern is that it could shift tensions from universities and government to scientists and their institutions.

Possible forms of self-regulation such as this so-called fixed-price or fixed-obligation grant are likely to be one

of the first—and one of the more controversial—topics to be considered by a new body currently being set up to provide a forum for government and university representatives to discuss problems of mutual concern. The idea of such a forum, under informal discussion for some time, was placed officially on the agenda of the National Commission on Research, which suggested in a report on accountability published last March that a permanent body "might provide a non-adversarial setting for persons from the public, Congress, universities and federal agencies to watch over the government-university relationship and guide its evolution."

Support for the idea has since been gathering momentum. It was one of the proposals of the recent report on science and engineering education prepared for President Carter by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education. Several top officials in the Department of Health and Human Services are enthusiastic, as Director Frank Press and others at the Office of Science and Technology Policy are also said to  
*(Continued on page 2)*

## In Brief

Would the White House science office survive in a Reagan Administration? He's indicated that it would, in replies to questions posed to the candidates by *Physics Today*. "The role of the President's Science Adviser...would be more informal and more public. The President's (science?) staff would be improved in quality, representing all specialties and disciplines," Reagan stated.

He also expressed interest in exploring "the feasibility of a 'Science Court,' to help arrange public discussions of controversial scientific issues." The "court," a gimmicky notion that got some attention several years ago, has dropped out of sight, but if Reagan is elected, might experience a revival.

Carter's response to the journal's inquiry mainly took the line that he's been sensitive and generous to science, and will continue that way. Of interest, however, was Carter's assertion that "we recognize the importance of contacts and exchanges with the Soviets and these should be continued where they are advantageous to us or humanitarian in nature." Sounds like a relaxation of the exchange cutback might be in the offing, if Carter wins.

## ...Proposed Forum Seen as Easing Tension

(Continued from page 1)

be. And Vice President Walter Mondale has committed himself to further exploration of this approach.

The main purpose of the forum, at least as many university and research administrators now see it, would be to reduce the tension which they feel colors their relationships with federal agencies. These have been generated by a number of factors, including the increasing magnitude of the research enterprise, and the impact of social legislation ranging from equal-opportunity requirements to stringent health and safety regulations.

Perhaps most prominent, however, has been the fall-out from growing distrust of the way that universities and their research staff use federal funds. Both federal and university officials agree that, in comparison with other areas of potential abuse, the problems in universities are small change. But they have been made both more prominent and more complex to handle by the degree of trust necessarily involved in any flexible arrangement. And recent well-publicized reports from the General Accounting Office have identified millions of dollars spent on research projects for which documentation of costs was found skimpy or non-existent.

OMB officials are not too sympathetic with the universities on this score. They argue that adequate accounting is one of the responsibilities attached to receipt of federal funds, and that the revised Circular A-21 should, in theory, make this easier to achieve.

But the universities have kept up their complaints of overzealous demands by accountants who, they claim, do not understand the "delicate balance" between the various responsibilities of the research scientist. In particular, their attack has focused on the new demand that scientists provide a complete account of how their time is divided up throughout the academic year, assigning strict proportions to research, teaching, administration and other activities.

Despite protests from both individual and professional societies—Saunders MacLane, Vice President of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote in the October 10 issue of *Science* that 100 percent reporting is "meaningless, invasive, inappropriate, counterproductive and ineffective"—OMB refused to delay the implementa-

tion of the new rules, which came into force in July, and covering reporting requirements for universities whose financial year starts after October 1, 1980.

Under further pressure from groups such as the Association of American Universities (AAU), however, OMB officials have agreed to consider possible changes that would still meet their requirements while reducing the burden on universities. Several meetings have already taken place between federal and university officials. And OMB has agreed to an experiment, at ten institutions, which will involve trying to evaluate the distribution of scientists' efforts on a statistical basis, rather than individual by individual.

But more profound changes are now being sought. Several university administrators are arguing that the

### *Why the Fuss Now on A-21—Page 4*

time may be ripe to revise the "cost reimbursement" basis for paying for research project grants, introduced during World War II when the government started funding university science in a big way, often with neither side starting with firm knowledge of the likely costs. The argument is that this approach, given the leverage which financial accounting provides the government over the universities' activities, may now have become counter-productive.

The proposal for change was spelled out in the last of five reports by the National Commission on Research (which, having completed the work for which it was set up in 1978, has now gone out of business). In its report "Funding Mechanisms: Balancing Objectives and Resources in University Research," the Commission recommends experimentation with grants-in-aid managed at the local level "to reduce administrative complexity and to focus emphasis on scientific accountability as opposed to excessively detailed fiscal accountability."

According to the Commission, a grant-in-aid "would be an award made in response to a normal research proposal including a detailed budget like the current NSF and NIH proposals, but with the accounting to the

(Continued on page 3)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher  
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher  
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents

Anne Roark, Clive Cookson (Washington); Michael Kenward (London); Francois Segurier (Paris)

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$118.50 (two years, \$198.50); individuals, \$48.50 (two years, \$82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

## ...NIH Group Backs New Reporting System

(Continued from page 2)

Federal government limited to scientific reporting, and with the fiscal management delegated to the investigator and his institution. The Commission believes that the incentives for wise management of resources which are inherent in the research funding system reduces the risk of fraud, abuse or inefficiency to a minimal level."

Support is now being generated by groups such as the AAU for an experimental trial with this new grant mechanism, perhaps by selecting five or ten institutions whose NIH grants could be awarded on such a basis for a trial period. Details of what might be involved were discussed at last month's meeting of the Director of NIH's Advisory Committee (DAC), and received general approval, though several potential drawbacks and pitfalls were also raised.

In a paper submitted to the DAC meeting, National Commission member Linda Wilson, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Research at the University of Illinois, Urbana, described the various aspects of the proposal. The main change from current practice, she said, would be in the post-award administration. Full responsibility for managing the funds awarded would be delegated to the grantee institution, to be handled in accordance with established institutional policy; only technical reports would be required by NIH, and no financial reporting to the federal government would be required. Time and effort reporting would be restricted to the needs of the institution and to the needs for developing indirect cost rate proposals, and not for project by project accounting.

There are several obstacles to easy implementation. One difficulty is semantic, in that although the idea has previously been talked about as a "fixed-price grant," some Commission officials feel that this could invoke an accounting approach used for general *procurement* contracts—where a specific result is paid for by the federal government—whereas they would like the dominant philosophy to be that research is paid for as *assistance*. (Current nomenclature calls for "fixed-obligation grants"—FOGs, for short?)

This dilemma is reflected within the federal agencies. Commenting on the Commission proposal at the NIH meeting, NIH Associate Director for Extramural Research William Raub pointed out the advantage of financial accountability was that it did not rely on a scientific accomplishment being a "win or lose test" for an award. Shifting the center of gravity from cost accountability to performance accountability would place a new burden on performance accounting, he said. And there are no obvious mechanisms for doing this effectively.

Other problems could be encountered by university scientists, who would, under the proposed scheme, be more directly accountable to university administrators. "As a principal investigator (PI), I am worried that this puts PIs against their employing institutions. We as PIs worry about this; we want to know that we will be able to keep our share of research awards and would want some type of safeguard against too much being absorbed in indirect costs," said committee member Howard Temin of the University of Wisconsin.

Supporters of the fixed-obligation grant admit that many such obstacles remain to be negotiated. Also that the new granting mechanism is unlikely to save very much money—or that any increase in productivity will necessarily be measurable in a way that can justify the change. The main advantage, as they see it, is that it would lessen the friction between universities and the federal government and help, in the words of the Commission, to "restore the quality of the partnership."

In this, the Commission's proposals have received a sympathetic hearing within the White House Science Office (OSTP). According to Associate Director Denis Prager, one of OSTP's top priorities has been to reduce the burden of "non-budgetary" constraints on research—in other words, "to see what we could do about getting the government off the scientists' backs." And shifting responsibility for financial accountability for scientific accountability ties in closely with OSTP's general strategy on regulation, which is to place greater emphasis on performance standards, and less on following line-by-line controls.

Federal auditors may take more convincing. What the universities see as a more efficient administrative system is viewed by some as merely an attempt to reduce the general degree of accountability to social controls. And however much the Commission and the AAU may argue that it is still possible to build adequate controls into alternative granting mechanisms, there remains considerable skepticism about how effective this would be in practice, and whether it would be sufficient to meet Congressional mandates about the steps necessary to reduce fraud and abuse.

There is more sympathy at the top, where both Bowman Cutter, Executive Director of OMB—who has been keeping a close eye on Circular A-21 revisions—and the Comptroller General, Elmer Staats, are both known to be sympathetic to the universities' point of view. In the next few months, their support could prove crucial in selling the idea of alternative funding mechanisms to their own staff, to other federal agencies, and to the appropriate Congressional committees.

—David Dickson

(The author is Washington news editor of *Nature*.)

## Why Academic Scientists Rage Against A-21

The A-21 problem centers on the so-called time-and-effort reports, which require university faculty members who receive government grants to keep track of how they spend their professional time—whether in laboratory, office, classroom, or at home.

For at least two decades, university business officers have been wrangling with the President's budget office over these accounting procedures, which are intended to prevent fraud and waste in government-sponsored research projects. Last year, however, a new compromise—latest of a long series—was reached, and in recent months a detailed set of formulas and requirements has been falling into place on most campuses.

So why all the fuss now?

"Because most faculty members are only now learning about what is required of them," said Serge Lang, a mathematician at Yale University who is leading much of the opposition against the new accounting requirements.

"Some department chairmen are ignoring the requirements altogether and some universities have asked for delays in implementing the new requirements...But you can bet, as more faculty members learn about this absurd imposition on our time and our freedom, you are going to see a great deal more protest."

Although Lang says it's "absolutely inconceivable" that university researchers won't win the battle over the reporting requirements, most government officials involved in the debate say the whole issue may blow over before any substantive changes in the rules are made.

One official at the Department of Health and Human Services, for instance, recently characterized the researchers who have spoken out as a "handful of obstinate, if not dishonest, scientists who are unwilling to account for their time—to the government or anyone else."

Another official, at the Office of Management and Budget, insists that, once university accountants and faculty members understand the entire system and the options that are available in keeping track of faculty time, they will conclude that it's a reasonable system OMB has designed.

All that the rules require, OMB officials say, is that university grantees keep track of the portion of time they devote to research, teaching, administration, and other activities. Any change in those ratios must be reported so that government officials will be able to decide what share of indirect or overhead costs of research the government should pay on the projects it supports.

OMB also predicts that when faculty members understand the rules, they will not be bothered by them. University business officers, OMB says, once objected

to the accounting procedures on the grounds that they would cost universities millions of dollars, but eventually found them not too burdensome—or so OMB says.

After all, said John Lordon, Director of OMB's Financial Management Branch, the taxpayers are "buying" services from the universities in the form of research and they have a right to know that the universities are not misusing the funds.

Even if the universities are not misspending millions of dollars, as some government officials think, it would still be prudent for universities to cooperate with the government's effort to place tight controls on federal spending, said Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

(Continued on page 5)

## In Print

*R&D Mexico*, smartly designed monthly magazine recently launched by the Mexican Council of Science and Technology to provide foreigners with current information about research and related matters in that country; Subscriptions \$12 (US) per year; available from: R&D Mexico, Subscription Service Dept., PO Box 992, Farmingdale, NY 11737.

*World Petroleum Availability 1980-2000*, a technical memorandum, 76 pages, prepared by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, concedes a wide range of uncertainty on supplies, but concludes "it is highly likely that there will be little or no increase in world production of oil from conventional sources." Available at \$4 per copy from: Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, D.C. 20402; specify Stock No. 052-003-00781-9.

A two-page listing of over 30 energy-related documents (hearings, reports, etc.), published since February 1979 by the House Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production, may be obtained by writing to: Publications Office, Committee on Science and Technology, US House of Representatives, 3154 House Office Building, Annex 2, Washington, D.C. 20515; tel. (202) 225-6275. Request Energy and Production Publication list for the 96th Congress. The publications are available without charge; supply limited, however.

*Seminar on Research, Productivity and the National Economy*, transcript of discussion held in June before the House Committee on Science and Technology; plus additional material; 111 pages, available without charge from: Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, Suite 2321 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.



## ...Pressure Growing for OMB to Change Rules

(Continued from page 4)

By dwelling on the cost of implementing the new accounting procedures, Staats added, researchers have failed to recognize "the serious costs in terms of credibility and trust of not having good controls."

Although government officials may be sanguine that the trouble about the time-and-effort requirements in A-21 will go away, there is growing evidence to suggest that they may be wrong.

For one thing, the number of protests that have been lodged against the new reporting requirement is large—and growing.

Late last month, for example, the faculty senates at the University of Kansas and University of Connecticut passed resolutions denouncing OMB's attempts to keep track of faculty time. The month before that, the University of Texas at Austin passed its own resolution. And before that, faculty members at the University of California, Yale, and a half dozen other schools acted.

"In our judgment," said William Glade, chairman of the Texas faculty, "this action by the OMB is a singularly egregious example of ill-informed and misplaced bureaucratic zeal."

University faculties, however, are not the only ones who are speaking out. Before the summer was over, at least a dozen scientific groups had called for a suspension of the A-21 rules until some better system could be worked out. The roster of those groups include the National Academy of Sciences, the council of the American Mathematical Society, the Association of American Universities, the Delegation for Basic Biomedical Research, and the Council of Scientific Society Presidents.

Some A-21 opponents feel their interests were poorly represented by their university business officers and by the professional organizations that participated in the original negotiations with OMB. And there's some corroboration for that complaint.

In a recent letter to OMB, Newton O. Cattell, Executive Director for Federal Relations at the Association of American Universities, said that, because researchers themselves were not consulted, the associations that had helped draft the new regulations had overlooked what is perhaps the single most serious problem with the new regulations.

"In retrospect," Cattell concluded, "we see that we should have focused on the 100-percent reporting requirement. It was not until university faculties reacted to efforts to implement the new requirements that we realized the full effect of 100-percent reports on the academic environment."

Some OMB officials have even backed down a bit, although it is unclear whether their shift is due to the

original negotiations of the business officers or whether they, too, are beginning to see that the university researchers may have a point.

If OMB fails to satisfy the academics, Congress can step in and try to force the budget office to back down from its original demands. But with a lame duck session coming up, it is hard to know how far the lawmakers might be willing to go.

Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), chairman of the Judiciary's Subcommittee on the Constitution, has already joined university researchers in protesting the cost-accounting procedures. The procedures specified in Circular A-21 are "precisely the kind of paperwork requirement that has proven to be so deadly to the creative spirit," the Senator said in a letter to the budget office.

But will Bayh and other university sympathizers go any further than simply writing letters?

"At this point, it's just a matter of wait-and-see," said Joe Allen, of the subcommittee staff.—Anne Roark

(The author is an assistant editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.)

## De Simone Resigns from OTA

Daniel De Simone, Deputy Director of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment since its founding in 1973, has resigned to become a consultant and also to work on a book based on his experience with government programs related to industrial innovation.

De Simone was director of the Office of Invention and Innovation at the National Bureau of Standards 1964-69, and also served at the White House science office and as director of the US Metric Study. He's setting up a consulting organization, The Innovation Group, which will offer services to industry, government, and international organizations. Address: Innovation Group, 2743 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va. 22207; tel. (703) 528-3702.

## AAAS Creates "Whistleblower" Award

The American Association for the Advancement of Science has established a \$1000 annual award "to honor scientists and engineers whose actions, often at significant personnel cost, have exemplified principles of scientific freedom and responsibility."

Criteria for the award include protection of public safety and health, focusing public attention on important issues, and establishing precedents in "carrying out the social responsibilities or in defending the professional freedom of scientists and engineers." Deadline for nominations is June 30, 1981. Address: Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award, AAAS, 1515 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

## Scientists, Engineers for Carter: A Cool Endorsement

Lookouts were despairing this year for the quadrennial mobilization of scientific and engineering celebrities in behalf of the presidential candidates. They've finally been slightly rewarded—with the debut of a mixed-bag 19-member Scientists and Engineers for Carter/Mondale Committee—but the arrival came late in the campaign and shows none of the zest that characterized some similar efforts in the past.

The committee, announced in a mailed press release that SGR received in mid-October, is headed by John Deutch, MIT chemist who was formerly chief of research and Deputy Secretary of the Department of Energy.

An accompanying statement suggests that Deutch and his colleagues are not enthusiastic about Carter, but that, considering the alternative, the incumbent is the best available choice. Thus, after stating that Carter has been good for science, energy, national security and arms control, the statement adds:

"Indeed, we do not agree among ourselves or with the Administration on all aspects of these vital issues.

Nonetheless, responsible progress will depend upon the leadership and judgment of the next President, and on balance, we believe that President Carter and the Democratic Party are the best choices in this election for the next four years. The other members of the committee are:

Hans Bethe, Professor Emeritus, Cornell  
 Sidney Drell, Deputy Director, Stanford Accelerator  
 Freeman J. Dyson, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton  
 Albert J. Fritsch, Appalachia Science in Public Interest  
 H. Hugh Fudenberg, Professor, Medical University of South, Charleston, South Carolina  
 Murray Gell-Mann, Professor of Physics, Caltech  
 Edward L. Ginzton, Chairman, Varian Associates  
 Daniel E. Koshland Jr., Professor of Biochemistry, UC Berkeley  
 Leon Lederman, Director, Fermi Lab  
 George Pake, Vice President, Xerox Corp.  
 George E. Palade, Professor of Cell Biology, Yale  
 Arthur H. Purcell, lecturer, American University  
 Alexander Rich, Professor of Biophysics, MIT  
 Burton Richter, Professor of Physics, Stanford  
 Marshall N. Rosenblith, Professor of Physics, Univ. of Texas  
 Donald W. Seldin, Professor, Health Science Center, Univ. of Texas  
 Charles W. Townes, Professor of Physics, UC Berkeley  
 Jerome B. Wiesner, Professor, former President, MIT

## France: Campaign Launched to Boost R&D Funds

*Paris.* During a recent luncheon attended by President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and representatives of the scientific community, the Secretary of State for Research, Pierre Aigrain, presented his White Paper on science. Titled "Building the Future," the 500-page tome follows this past summer's publication of the Eighth Plan for Research, and is part of the major campaign to build support for a major expansion of the nation's research activities.

The test provides a long epistemological dissertation developing the themes of a speech made by the President before the Academy of Sciences in February 1980: "The true vocation of France in the world, its primary wealth is the excellence and fertility of its intelligence," he said. The White Paper, "on the contribution of scientific research to the progress of France during the period 1980-1990," is therefore heavily colored with positivism and "gallocentrism."

First of all of positivism, because a task of the White Paper was first to demonstrate that only R&D can resolve the present economic crisis and then to justify to the public a real budgetary expansion. This campaign succeeded. For several days all French media spoke quite frequently of science. The awarding of the Nobel Prize in medicine to a Frenchman—a relatively rare event—came at the right time to reinforce this publicity campaign. Prof. Jean Dausset, who split the Nobel

Prize with the two Americans, was congratulated by Giscard d'Estaing with the assertion that: "This award justifies the confidence that I have for French research and researchers. It confirms in me the will to give priority to the scientific effort on which the future of our country depends."

Each of the chapters of the first part of the White Paper argues that research supports progress. Though they do not contain many practical suggestions, the chapters direct themselves to closer linking of researchers to other sectors of the economy. Within the domain of the life sciences, the White Paper takes up once again the conclusions of the report that three biologists, Francois Gros, Francois Jacob, and Pierre Royer, put forth last year to the President of the Republic. What is proposed is the establishment of an Institute of the Child and the creation of "Transfer Centers" to facilitate the transfer of the results of public research into production. As part of this latter proposal, an employment agency would be established to place biologists and biotechnicians who wanted to change from the lab to other activities. Finally, the Secretary of State for Research would be in charge of the "heavy logistics" of the life sciences: breeding, mass production of animal and vegetable cells, living material conservation banks, and data banks for genetic material.

(Continued on page 7)

## ...French Academy Urges Caution on Everything

(Continued from page 6)

As for the sciences of man (which includes, for the authors of the White Paper, philosophy), what is proposed is the creation of large libraries. A relatively modest demand, it marks nevertheless a regaining of interest for historic reflection on science. At the time of publication of the White Paper, the government also unveiled a project for a museum of science and industry. This museum would open its doors at the end of 1984. Located in La Villette, a neighborhood to the north of Paris formerly occupied by slaughterhouses and butcher shops, it will be three times as large as the massive Georges Pompidou art museum in the Beaubourg neighborhood. The architectural design has been chosen, and the architects' mock-ups were shown for several weeks at the Palais de l'Elysee (the official residence of the President of the Republic).

It was the President who made the choice, which makes it clear that he desires this museum to be for his presidency what the Beaubourg Center is to that of President Pompidou.

The chapters dealing with the "hard" sciences are less precise in their operational demands. Mathematics, the physical sciences, and earth sciences were already singled out for growth in previous budgetary decisions.

The only dissenting note to this campaign of confidence in science and its results comes, curiously, from the Academy of Science. A three-hundred-year old institution, the Academy has progressively been losing power. In the last two years, attempts have been made to give it new tasks and bring in some younger blood. Nevertheless, in the preface that the Academy wrote for the White Paper, it urges caution, stating that "there is a contradiction at the root between scientific discovery and programming. It is thus not prudent to make lists of priorities within disciplines in terms of their usefulness." Even worse, the Academy disputes the usefulness of moving researchers from one lab to another, a major government goal in this professionally sedentary country. The old gentlemen of the Academy wanted to defend the cause of pure science (and of basic research) and in doing so also criticized a major theme of the White Paper's second part, "Research in the Nation." This part claims that it is necessary for France to play a major role in the world of science.

The role of the elders of the Academy as a brake on French science was clearly seen by the authors of the White Paper. In one section they warn that the effectiveness of the nation's research enterprise is threatened by the rising average age of the science community—particularly among physicists, a discipline long dominant in Academy affairs.—FS

## NSF Science Board Now Up to Full Membership

*Following is the newly filled-out roster of the National Science Board, the official policymaking body of the National Science Foundation. Historically an inert entity, the Board has lately been showing more life than usual under its new chairman, Lewis Branscomb, Chief Scientist of IBM. He's been devoting a good deal of time to NSF affairs, particularly the big push to set up a parallel foundation for technology (SGR Vol. X, No. 16), which he opposes.*

Lewis M. Branscomb (Chairman) Vice President and Chief Scientist, IBM.

Herbert D. Doan (Vice Chairman) Chairman, Doan Resources Corporation, Midland, Michigan.

Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Vice President for Research and Development, Tyco Laboratories, Inc., Tyco Park, Exeter, New Hampshire.

Lloyd M. Cooke, Vice Chairman, Economic Development Council of New York City, Inc.

Eugene H. Cota-Robles, Professor of Biology, Biology Board of Studies, University of California at Santa Cruz.

Peter T. Flawn, President, University of Texas at Austin.

Ernestine Friedl, Dean of Arts and Sciences and Trinity College, and Professor of Anthropology, Duke University.

Mary L. Good, Boyd Professor of Materials Science, Division of Engineering Research, Louisiana State University.

John R. Hogness, President, Association of Academic Health Centers, Washington, D.C.

William F. Hueg, Jr., Professor of Agronomy and Deputy Vice President and Dean, Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Michael Kasha, Distinguished Professor of Physical Chemistry, Institute of Molecular Biophysics, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Marian E. Koshland, Professor of Bacteriology and Immunology, Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, University of California at Berkeley.

Peter D. Lax, Professor of Mathematics, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University.

Walter E. Massey, Director, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois.

Homer A. Neal, Dean of Research and Graduate Development, and Professor of Physics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Mary Jane Osborn, Professor and Head, Department of Microbiology, University of Connecticut School of Medicine, Farmington, Connecticut.

Joseph M. Pettit, President, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

David V. Ragone, President, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

Donald B. Rice, Jr., President, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

Stuart A. Rice, Frank P. Hixon Distinguished Service Professor of Chemistry, The James Franck Institute, University of Chicago.

Alexander Rich, Sedgwick Professor of Biophysics, Department of Biology, MIT.

Edwin E. Salpeter, J.G. White Professor of Physical Sciences, Cornell University.

Charles P. Slichter, Professor of Physics and in the Center for Advanced Study, University of Illinois, Urbana.

## News Notes: R&D Funds; Distress at Academy

While the Administration continues to insist that it's providing academic science with extra helpings of purchasing power, a new report by the National Science Foundation states that "the 9-percent increase in Federal R&D funding to universities proposed in the President's 1981 budget will permit little if any real growth in the early eighties."

The NSF assertion is contained in *Academic Science 1972-77*, which is slightly misleading in its title, since some of the figures are estimated up to 1979. In any case, regardless of the election-season hoopla that's been fed to the scientific community, the issue of beating the official inflation rate is often fuzzed up when it comes to R&D spending. Science administrators and researchers, in and out of government, generally have no doubt that the cost of doing science is increasing at a faster pace than the consumer price index. But that fact gets no recognition in the official self-congratulations over the Administration's 9-percent boost in current dollars for R&D.

*Academic Science*, NSF Report No. 80-313, is available without charge from: National Science Foundation, Publications Office, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20500.

SGR's mole at the National Academy of Sciences reported that NAS President Philip Handler was distressed by publication last spring of a *Washington Post* editorial critical of the Academy Food and Nutrition Board report "Toward Healthful Diets," which was widely interpreted as downplaying the health hazards of fat and cholesterol (SGR Vol. X, No. 11).

Alert to the possibility of "disinformation," SGR, lacking corroboration, refrained from comment. It is now evident, however, that Handler at least took serious note of that editorial, for he says as much in a Q. and A. in the September/October *News and Views* of the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH), from which the following excerpt is taken:

**ACSH:**

What was the worst media comment on the board report?

**Handler:**

An editorial in the *Washington Post* written by Jessica Tuchman Matthews had the most potential for damaging the National Academy of Sciences. It asserted the Report has badly damaged the Academy's reputation, and then went on to charge that the Academy does not serve the country as well as it should. The editorial went on to cite a list of subjects that are allegedly terrible problems in American life, and which, it said have not been addressed by the Academy although quite the opposite was true. The editorial winds up proposing that since I am about to retire this would be the time for radical changes in the Academy.

Quite apart from the latter point, I disagreed with every sentence in that editorial. It was all very seriously flawed. Each sentence had a serious error in it or was misleading in some way.

William O. Baker, retired Chairman of the Board of Bell Labs, has been elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Rockefeller University, succeeding Patrick E. Haggerty, who died October 1.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

Xerox-University Microfilms  
300 N. Zeeb Rd  
Ann Arbor

9999

MI 48106



